

Eastern Illinois University The Keep

Masters Theses

Student Theses & Publications

1984

A Descriptive Study of Healthy Religion and Its Effects on Personality

Lowell R. Kivley

Eastern Illinois University

This research is a product of the graduate program in [Educational Psychology and Guidance](#) at Eastern Illinois University. [Find out more](#) about the program.

Recommended Citation

Kivley, Lowell R., "A Descriptive Study of Healthy Religion and Its Effects on Personality" (1984). *Masters Theses*. 2818.
<https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/2818>

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

THESIS REPRODUCTION CERTIFICATE

TO: Graduate Degree Candidates who have written formal theses.

SUBJECT: Permission to reproduce theses.

The University Library is receiving a number of requests from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow theses to be copied.

Please sign one of the following statements:

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university for the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

7/9/84

Date

Author

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University not allow my thesis be reproduced because _____

Date

Author

A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF HEALTHY RELIGION
AND ITS EFFECTS ON PERSONALITY
(TITLE)

BY

Lowell R. Kivley

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

M.S. in Ed.

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1984
YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

July 9, 1984
DATE
July 9, 1984
DATE
July 9, 1984
DATE
July 9, 1984
DATE

ADVISER

COMMITTEE MEMBER

COMMITTEE MEMBER

DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON

"To be, or not to be" religious is no longer the question, according to Erich Fromm. Religion of one form or another permeates humanity, sometimes encouraging, sometimes discouraging healthy personality. The purpose of this study is to analyze factors of healthy religion and to examine their potential association with healthy personality. Although this study did not support the hypothesis that a direct correlation exists between healthy religion and healthy personality (as measured by the Survey of Healthy Religion and Personality), it did bring to light several areas which should interest religious leaders in terms of planning religious instruction. Both secular and sacred works are cited in this eclectic approach to studying healthy religion.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction	p. 1
II. Review of Pertinent Literature	p. 5
III. Method	p. 21
IV. Discussion	p. 28
V. End Notes by Chapter	p. 35
VI. Bibliography	p. 37
VII. Appendix	p. 39

I. INTRODUCTION

The inter-relationship of psychology and religion has been apparent ever since the advent of study of the human psyche. Unfortunately, early psychologists and theologians were at odds as to whose ideas and efforts were unnecessary.

But now more experts in both fields are beginning to make room for both disciplines. Fromm points out:

Curiously enough the interests of the devoted religionist and of the psychologist are the same in this respect. The theologian is keenly interested in the specific tenets of a religion, his own and others, because what matters to him is the truth of his belief against the others. Equally, the psychologist must be keenly interested in the specific contents of religion for what matters to him is what human attitude a religion expresses and what kind of effect it has on man, whether it is good or bad for the development of man's powers.¹

And this inter-relationship is not only seen from a psychologist's viewpoint. Indeed, theologians are discovering that psychology has much to add to their understanding of their religions. Speaking for the Christian perspective, Gross goes so far as to state, "What we are learning now is really as old as Christ. It took psychiatry to reveal our own religion to us."²

Kelsey adds:

We begin to see that salvation consists of a "from what," a "to what" and a "how." Theological writings often gives us a "from what" and

a "to what," but is silent about a "how." Most psychological writing, even the best of it, gives considerable insights into a "from what" and a "how" but shies away from presenting a goal or direction or value for our lives.³

The assumption can be made that one cannot deal with religion without also dealing with psychology. It may also be assumed that one cannot deal with psychology without also dealing with certain aspects of religion. The purpose of this study is to explore the relationship of these two fields through a synthesis of the ideas of many notable psychologists and theologians. Although much has been written concerning religion and psychology, very little has been done in the area of defining healthy religion and exploring the effects of healthy religion on personality.

Gladding, Lewis, and Adkins constructed a scale to measure religiousity in order to establish groupings of highly religious and not religious persons for the sake of comparing their scores on other various tests, but they did not seek to establish any links between religion and healthy personality. They did discover, however, that highly religious individuals tended to have a high internal locus of control, high purpose in life, low hedonistic values, and low alienation in comparison with other groups.⁴ It can also be noted that those who were highly religious tended to be at both extremes on the personality tests which they administered.

This study concerns itself with what may be considered a logical question raised by the previously mentioned study--what factors or beliefs account for these personality differences? And even more importantly, working with the assumption that religious beliefs are here to stay, what religious beliefs tend to foster healthy personality? In a nutshell, this study is an attempt to differentiate between tenets of healthy and unhealthy religion.

The hypothesis of interest in this study is: A direct correlation exists between scores on the healthy religion index and scores on the healthy personality index of the Scale of Healthy Religion and Personality. The null hypothesis is: No correlation exists between scores on the healthy religion index and scores on the healthy personality index of the Scale of Healthy Religion and Personality.

As a study of elements of healthy religion and their influences on healthy personality, it is this investigator's desire that this might serve as a challenge to introspection and self-analysis of one's religious convictions in the hope that such a challenge will result in a greater understanding of one's religious beliefs and thus in a more fulfilling and satisfying life. It is the conviction of this investigator that all parts of one's life should contribute to the fullness of enjoyment in living.

Fullness of living is the theme of this study. Discovering how religion and religious beliefs effect this fullness is the goal and purpose. In summary, this study asks the question, "What can my religion do for me?"

II. REVIEW OF PERTINENT LITERATURE

Religion will effect the life quality of those who have a meaningful faith. Both psychologists and theologians are in agreement about this. But while many have attempted to analyze religion on the basis of trueness or falseness of a religious outlook, few have sought to define religion in terms of healthy and unhealthy beliefs. However, this study will consider what has been written about religion by many psychologists and theologians alike, in an attempt to differentiate between healthy and unhealthy religious beliefs. This chapter concludes with a composite listing of characteristics of healthy religious beliefs.

Freud saw religion as neurosis. According to Freud, religion springs from within oneself to meet:

1. the necessity for defending itself (the religious person) against the crushing supremacy of nature
2. the eager desire to correct the so painfully felt imperfections of culture
3. the longing for a father¹

Freud's view of religion as neurosis is readily understood when one comes to understand his objectives in life and his objections to religion.

Freud sought to encourage knowledge, brother love, reduction of suffering, independence, and responsibility.²

It seems quite obvious that Freud held to an extremely high view of man and his abilities. But overcoming one's emotions, or at least being freed from them, seems to be a cornerstone of Freud's work. Man, if he was only free to reason, could accomplish anything. And indeed, Fromm supports this understanding of Freud:

Only the free man who has emancipated himself from authority--authority that threatens and protects--can make use of his power of reason and grasp the world and his role in it objectively, without illusion but also with the ability to develop and to make use of the capacities inherent in him.³

Freud objected to religion on three ground. His first objection was that religion sanctifies bad human institutions.⁴ Religion lies in the realm of the affective consciousness, an area outside the grasp of rationality. Thus, religious institutions did not have to subscribe to rational standards because they were at least outside the boundries of such standards, if not, in the views of religionists, above them.

Freud's second objection was that religion is responsible for the impoverishment of intelligence.⁵

For Freud, religion has its origin in man's helplessness in confronting the forces of nature outside and the instinctive forces within himself. Religion arises at an early stage of human development when man cannot yet use his reason to deal with those outer and inner forces and must repress them or manage them with the help of other affective forces. So instead of coping with them by means of reason he copes with them by counter-affects, by other emotional forces, the function which are to suppress and control that which he is powerless to cope with rationally.⁶

So it is with this objection that Freud accuses religion of being a neurosis. Rather than encouraging a person to grow up and deal with the forces that cause anxieties and unsurities, "religion, according to Freud, is a repetition of the experience of the child."⁷

Freud's final objection to religion is that basing morality on religion is basing morality on what he considered to be shaky grounds.⁸ Freud was convinced that religion was on its way out as an influential factor in the average person's daily life. Therefore, religion was not a sound basis for morality because while Freud thought morality to be indispensable, religion was dispensible.

Although Freud undoubtedly believed religions to be false, his objections were based on the views that religion was useless at best, and even harmful to the enterprise of living a complete life.

Carl Jung, on the other hand, saw religions (not as institutions, but as experiences) as having the potential of being greatly beneficial. Indeed, Jung reports,

No matter what the world thinks about religious experience, the one who has it possesses the great treasure of a thing that has provided him with a source of life, meaning and beauty and that has given a new splendor to the world and to mankind. He has pistis and peace.⁹

In contrast to Freud's views of religion as being beliefs which spring from within the person, Jung views religion as something that happens to a person. According

to Jung, religion is, "a dynamic existence or effect, not caused by an arbitrary act of will ... it seizes and controls the human subject, which is always rather its victim than its creator."¹⁰

Although Freud seems to discount religion as always a neurosis, Jung chooses to leave the door open for healthy religion. Even though Jung does not use the term, he does provide some criteria for discerning healthy religion.

Jung says:

We must take them (religious experiences) as we experience them. And if such experience helps to make your life healthier, more beautiful, more complete and more satisfactory to yourself and to those you love, you may safely say: "This was the grace of God."¹¹

So both Freud and Jung point to religion as a contact with one's affective resources. While Freud maintains that one's intellect is destined to overrule one's emotions, Jung maintains that one's emotions may have great usefulness in adding to life's satisfaction.

Clift supplies this summary of Jung's view of religion:

In Jung's view, if God had no effect on a person, then God might as well not exist. If God was simply absolute and beyond all human experience, then Jung was not interested. But if God was something to be experienced in the soul, then, Jung said, "at once I must concern myself with him, for then he can effect me in practical ways."¹²

Fromm also seems to have concerned himself with healthy religion. Fromm provides the following thoughts and insights concerning possible criteria of healthy religion:

If religious teachings contribute to the growth, strength, freedom, and happiness of their believers, we see the fruits of love. If they contribute to the constriction of human potentialities, to unhappiness and lack of productivity, they cannot be born of love, regardless of what the dogma intends to convey.¹³

Fromm chooses to label the first mentioned type of religion as "humanistic religion" and the last as "authoritarian religion."¹⁴ Joy is the prevailing mood of humanistic religion whereas sorrow and guilt are the prevailing moods of authoritarian religion.

Like Jung, Fromm disagreed with Freud concerning the ultimate victory of the intellect over emotion. In fact, Fromm defined religion in such broad terms that everyone is said to be religious. Fromm defined religion as a frame of orientation with an object of devotion.¹⁵ So also like Jung, Fromm was faced with the choice of whether one's religion was constructive or destructive, rather than whether or not one would have a religion.

Although Allport's view of religion and God is more similar to Freud's, he does not go so far as to say that God is merely a father figure, even though God may be that to the person if the individual needs a father figure at the time. Allport writes:

Over and over again in a multitude of ways, the religion of the individual brings to a focus the mingled motives and desires of an unfulfilled life. Divine attributes plainly conform to the panorama of desire, although the individual is seldom aware that his approach to his deity is determined by his present need.¹⁶

Even though Allport holds that individuals create their God to suit their own needs, he does differentiate between two types of religious experience: infantile and mature religious sentiments. He describes the mature religious sentiment as that which:

... lays itself open to all facts, to all values, and disvalues, and claims to have the clue to their theoretical and practical inclusion in a frame of life. With such a task to perform it is impossible for this sentiment in a mature stage of development to remain disconnected from the mainstream of experience, relegated to a corner of the fantasy life where it provides an escape clause in one's contract with reality.¹⁷

Allport goes on to give this list of characteristics of mature religious sentiment:

1. Mature religious sentiment is well differentiated.
2. It is dynamic in character in spite of its derivative nature.
3. It produces consistent morality.
4. It is comprehensive.
5. It is integral.
6. It is fundamentally heuristic.

For the purpose of this study, Allport's description of the mature religious sentiment will be equated with being his statement about the nature of healthy religion.

Paul Tournier is perhaps the best known of what are called "Christian Psychologists." It is interesting to note that he does not have a degree in psychology, but rather is a general practitioner with a medical degree.

His work with patients convinced him of his need for psychological studies and so he began studying psychology on his own. As a Christian, he sought to integrate his new learning with his beliefs. In doing so, he lists the following things that religion should accomplish:

1. Restore unity to the individual (He argues that psychology seeks to fragment man)
2. Answer the questions of destiny, evil, and death
3. Maintain a distinction between condemning and converting
4. Provide community¹⁹

Speaking of Freud's analysis of religion, Tournier writes:

I have spoken of the boldness with which, not many years ago, Freud thought it possible to derive from his newly discovered science a definitive explanation of religion, philosophy, and poetry, which he proposed to reduce to simple psychic functions. And I have shown that already his most faithful disciples have obliged to depart from him on this central point and recognize that the world of spiritual values eludes psychological analysis.²⁰

But other Christian Psychologists have also commented on the role of religion in promoting mental health. Ellens writes:

The history of religion is the history of the human endeavor to devise functional anxiety reduction mechanisms capable of managing situational and systemic angst. That long religious history easily divides into two radically opposite camps, shaped by radically differing strategies for anxiety reduction. The most prominent camp, historically, is shaped by the anxiety reduction strategy of human achievement, measuring up to a set of psychosocial standards of function which then authorize self-justification. This is essentially a strategy of self justification by achievement of an ethical or psychosocial power position. It

is essentially self-centered and self-directed, tends to be legalistic and mechanistic, is not growth oriented but status oriented, and since it treats symptoms of the generic human anxiety, never effectively reduces anxiety. God remains the adversary who must be placated, outflanked, or intimidated. All religions throughout human history, save one, fall into this first camp: anxiety reduction by human achievement. The only exception to this general psychospiritual tragedy of human history ... is the unique Judeo-Christian theology of grace. This is the only religious perspective in all of human history in which God is not the adversary.²¹

Summarizing Ellens, then, a healthy religion is one which reduces anxiety, not through emphasizing human achievement, but rather by emphasizing divine acceptance and love.

Estadt, coming at a healthy religion from the perspective of training pastoral counselors, speaks of the healthy religious person as one who:

1. is a religiously integrated person
2. approaches others with a sense of mystery
3. enters into communion with others
4. encourages reconciliation (with self, others, and God) and personal religious integration²²

Clinebell provides this questionnaire concerning healthy religion:

1. Does the religious thought and practice build bridges or barriers between people?
2. Does it strengthen or weaken a basic sense of trust and relatedness to the universe?
3. Does it stimulate or hamper the growth of inner freedom and responsibility?
4. Does it provide effective means of helping a person move from a sense of guilt to forgiveness?

5. Does it provide well-defined, significant, ethical guidelines, or does it emphasize ethical trivia?
6. Does it increase or lessen the enjoyment of life?
7. Does it handle the vital energies of sex and aggressiveness in constructive or repressive ways?
8. Does it encourage the acceptance of reality?
9. Does it encourage intellectual honesty with doubts?
10. Does it face the complexities of the human situation?
11. Does it emphasize love or fear?
12. Does it provide a frame of orientation and an object of devotion?
13. Does it encourage communication with one's unconscious being through living symbols?
14. Does it attempt to change neurotic patterns of society?
15. Does it strengthen or weaken self-esteem?²³

Clinebell goes on to add a possible sixteenth criteria by stating, "Respect for the unique religious needs of one's neighbor is one indication of a mentally healthy religious view."²⁴

Few ministers have been as popular and unpopular at the same time as Robert Schuller. And it is interesting to note that it is the same characteristic which causes the differing reactions. One of the cornerstones of Schuller's work has been his emphasis on building self-esteem. Schuller maintains that one of the things that religion must do is build self-esteem through providing solutions to inferiority, depression, anxiety, guilt,

resentment, and fear.²⁵

Finally, George Anderson seems to be the one source that has wrestled with the idea of healthy religion to the extent that he dedicated an entire book to the topic. He lists these characteristics of the healthy religious person:

1. has an inner sense of security
2. possesses a healthy self-esteem
3. lives without a severe sense of guilt
4. is able to form love relationships
5. is able to laugh and have fun
6. looks at society and life realistically
7. avoids unrealistic ideals or fantasies
8. adjusts to both pleasures and pains
9. withstands reversals
10. acknowledges bodily desires and responds without undue guilt
11. appraises himself realistically
12. makes moral choices
13. establishes satisfactory life purposes and goals
14. learns from experience
15. satisfies the important requirements of his group while maintaining his ability to be independent²⁶

Perhaps one of the greatest arguments both for and against the lists of characteristics which the various authors have provided is that they all seem to come from psychology rather than from religion itself. It seems as though the authors could have studied psychology and then

said, "This is what our religion must do." However this need not be the case.

It is possible to see religious schools and psychological schools converging on what is desirable for man to experience. For example, a quick reading of the Book of Ephesians in the Bible reveals the following goals of the Christian life:

hope	faith
meaning	experiencing grace
wisdom	power
self-worth	good works
peace with others	membership to each other
sense of history	humility
service	freedom
confidence	strength of inner being
gentleness	patience
maturity	truthfulness
renewal of attitudes	forgiveness
love	thanksgiving
openness	mutual submission
making the most of every opportunity	

Although this is not a complete list, it does provide some clue as to possible reasons for what seems to be the overlap which was mentioned above.

In comparison, Maslow gives these characteristics of people who have experienced self-actualization:

1. efficient perception of reality
2. self-acceptance
3. spontaneity, simplicity, naturalness
4. problem-centeredness outside of self
5. need for privacy
6. high degree of autonomy
7. freshness of appreciation
8. frequent peak experiences
9. a brotherly feeling
10. forms close relationships
11. sees people as individuals
12. strong ethical sense
13. unhostile sense of humor
14. creativeness
15. resistance to enculturation²⁷

Several similarities readily present themselves in these two lists.

And other psychologists have their own definitions of healthy personality. The following chart, based on information gleaned from Sidney Jourard,²⁸ summarizes some of the most notable views and their advocates:

PSYCHOLOGIST	VIEW OF HEALTHY PERSONALITY
Fritz Perls	Living in the here and now
Eric Berne	Self-worth, reasonable demands, honesty
Victor Frankl	Meaning in life, even if it has to be assigned

PSYCHOLOGIST	VIEW OF HEALTHY PERSONALITY
Albert Ellis	Clear, valid thinking
Jugen Ruesch	Full communication
William Blatz	Learning skills to meet needs
B. F. Skinner	Ability to suppress actions which no longer yield positive reinforcement
Roberto Assagioli	Integration
Sigmund Freud	Ability to love and do work
Alfred Adler	Brotherly feeling toward fellow human beings
Otto Rank	Freedom to celebrate one's differences from others
Carl Jung	Gradual expression of the unconsciousness
Wilhelm Reich	Acceptance of vitality, sexual- ity, and emotions

Sidney Jourard summarized healthy personality as,
 "... a way for a person to act, guided by intelligence
 and respect for life, so that personal needs are satisfied
 and so that the person will grow in awareness, competence,
 and the capacity to love the self, the natural environment,
 and other people."²⁹

Augsburger talks about the healthy personality as one
 which is maturing.³⁰ The mature person will exhibit
 these characteristics:

1. a basic sense of trust rather than fear
2. constructive use of anger and other emotions
3. use of fear to facilitate appropriate action

4. full communication
5. self-acceptance without contentment
6. freedom to fail and to learn from failure
7. acceptance and respect for one's sexuality
8. willingness to change rather than expect others to change
9. encouragement, direction, and discipline for offspring
10. love, both giving and receiving
11. understanding when ill-treated
12. values other people
13. forgiveness of self and others
14. joy and happiness as by-products rather than goals

Summarizing Augsburger's view, "the maturing person is a person who is growing from self-centeredness, self-irresponsibility, and childish ignorance toward the wisdom of responsible, loving relationships with his fellows and his creator."³¹

Although some psychologists have dared to offer definitions of mental health, most have been concerned with what is not healthy personality. And as might be expected, a symposium on mental health held at Cornell University in 1958 found it easier to describe what mental health is not.

Mental health is not:

1. Adjustment under all circumstances (There are some circumstances to which man should not adjust, otherwise there would be no progress.)
2. Freedom from anxiety and tensions (They are often prerequisites and accompaniments of creativity and self-preservation.)

3. Freedom from dissatisfaction
4. Conformity (One criterion of maturity is the ability to stand apart from the crowd when conditions indicate.)
5. Constant happiness (In this world, a sensitive, mature person often experiences unhappiness.)
6. A lessening of accomplishment and creativity (Mental health is characterized by the ability of the individual to use his powers ever more fully.)
7. The absence of personal idiosyncrasies (Many such idiosyncrasies which do not interfere with function enrich the life of the individual and those who come in contact with him.)
8. The undermining of authority (Mental health is characterized by the increased ability of the individual to use and respect realistic authority while deprecating the use of authority as an oppressive force.)
9. Opposition to religious values (Mental health facilitates and compliments the aims of religion in as much as it fosters the highest spiritual and social values.)³²

It can readily be seen that healthy religion and healthy personality have many of the same characteristics. A composite list of characteristics of healthy religion includes:

1. Encourages knowledge and makes room for honest doubts
2. Encourages brotherly love for all
3. Reduces suffering by making life beautiful and complete
4. Encourages independence, freedom, and self-responsibility
5. Integral to all aspects of living
6. Encourages change and growth, personally and socially

7. Exhibits joy and love as the prevailing mood
8. Well differentiated yet heuristic
9. Produces consistent morality
10. Comprehensive, including answers to destiny, evil, death, etc.
11. Maintains a distinction between converting and condemning
12. Encourages a mystical component to a view of humanity
13. Encourages reconciliation with God, self, and others
14. Encourages a basic trust in the universe
15. Accepts natural impulses in appropriate contexts
16. Encourages a realistic look at life
17. Encourages intra-communication
18. Strengthens self esteem

Jesus said, "I have come that they may have life, and have it to the full."³³ Perhaps this is the best and most most comprehensive characteristics of all. Healthy religious beliefs should contribute to the over-all well-being of those who hold them.

III. METHOD

A. SUBJECTS

A total of 107 graduate and undergraduate students were given the Survey of Healthy Religion and Personality (SHRP), a survey based on the summary of characteristics of healthy religion provided at the end of the last chapter. Eighty of the subjects were female and twenty-seven were male. Thirty-eight of the subjects were 21 years old or under, sixty were between twenty-two and thirty-five, and nine were between thirty-six and fifty-five. No subjects reported that they were over fifty-five.

All of the above mentioned subjects are presently enrolled in courses which are required of all Education majors at Eastern Illinois University. It was assumed by this investigator that this sample would most closely resemble the population of Education majors at EIU.

B. APPARATUS

This investigator constructed the SHRP for the purpose of testing his hypothesis because a review of The Eighth MENTAL MEASUREMENTS YEARBOOK did not provide information about any tests which would measure the characteristics which were necessary for testing the hypothesis. A complete copy of the SHRP and the theoretical foundation of each

survey item can be found in the appendix.

The SHRP went through several draft stages; being reviewed by colleagues and/or professors at each stage to insure clarity and completeness. The final draft was reviewed by seven people who were similiar to the survey subjects in an attempt to insure that the items were capable of illiciting a definite respons.

C. PROCEDURE

The SHRP was administered in the first fifteen minutes of seven class periods. The survey, response forms, and pencils were distributed with instructions that no one was to make any marks or begin until all instruction were read aloud. The instructions were read and an additional comment was made assuring the subjects that no attempt would be made to identify them.

Analysis of the data was done through the Testing Services and Computer Services of Eastern Illinois University.

D. RESULTS

The following two tables report the percentages of responses to each of the survey items.

TABLE 1

Responses of those indicating they were religious (%)

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SA</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>O</u>	<u>SD</u>
1	16.5	54.1	14.1	12.9	1.2
2	31.8	44.7	14.1	8.2	1.2
3	22.4	49.4	17.6	10.6	0
4	37.6	49.4	8.2	3.5	1.2
5	22.4	45.9	21.2	9.4	1.2
6	15.3	50.6	16.5	16.5	1.2
7	9.4	35.3	7.1	38.8	9.4
8	15.3	51.8	16.5	16.5	1.2
9	62.4	32.9	3.5	0	0
10	43.5	45.9	4.7	3.5	2.4
11	1.2	7.1	11.8	57.6	22.4
12	1.2	7.1	18.8	52.9	20.0
13	15.3	54.1	22.4	8.2	0
14	5.9	30.6	28.2	29.4	5.9
15	27.1	50.6	10.6	11.8	0
16	21.2	67.1	10.6	1.2	0
17	49.4	43.5	5.9	0	0
18	5.9	25.9	8.2	43.5	16.5
19	35.3	56.5	4.7	3.5	0
20	1.2	22.4	18.8	55.3	1.2
21	35.3	54.1	5.9	3.5	0

TABLE 2

Survey responses of those who indicated they were religious are presented as the top figure. Survey responses of those who indicated they were not religious are presented immediately below. All data are expressed as percentages of respondents.

<u>Item</u>	<u>SA</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>O</u>	<u>SD</u>
22	2.4 0	24.7 0	7.1 9.1	45.9 59.1	20.0 31.8
23	4.7 13.6	23.5 9.1	8.2 0	43.5 50.0	20.0 27.3
24	5.9 22.7	35.3 45.5	21.2 13.6	30.6 9.1	7.1 9.1
25	7.1 9.1	17.6 4.5	11.8 0	52.9 50.0	10.6 36.4
26	1.2 4.5	23.5 27.3	40.0 27.3	27.1 22.7	8.2 18.2
27	18.8 13.6	51.8 31.8	10.6 13.6	17.6 40.9	0 0
28	17.6 31.8	68.2 45.5	8.2 9.1	4.7 13.6	1.2 0
29	16.5 31.8	54.1 45.5	23.5 13.6	5.9 4.5	0 4.5
30	1.2 0	8.2 9.1	9.4 4.5	61.2 45.5	20.0 40.9
31	2.3 4.5	14.1 0	5.9 9.1	44.7 54.5	32.9 31.8
32	11.8 13.6	57.6 54.5	0 0	14.1 27.3	1.2 4.5
33	24.7 40.9	69.4 59.1	5.9 0	0 0	0 0
34	21.2 46.5	68.2 50.0	9.4 4.5	1.2 0	0 0

TABLE 2 (cont.)

<u>Item</u>	<u>SA</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>SD</u>
35	2.4 3.6	21.2 27.3	61.2 50.0	11.8 4.5	2.4 4.5
36	0 0	4.7 18.2	7.1 0	49.4 22.7	38.8 54.5
37	0 0	11.8 13.6	11.8 13.6	61.2 40.9	14.1 31.8
38	41.2 50.0	50.6 50.0	5.9 0	1.2 0	1.2 0
39	5.9 4.5	24.7 31.8	15.3 13.6	47.1 40.9	7.1 9.1
40	4.7 9.1	44.7 45.5	29.4 22.7	16.5 18.2	2.4 4.5
41	24.7 40.9	70.6 54.5	4.7 4.5	0 0	0 0
42	20.0 36.4	37.6 31.8	17.6 13.6	21.2 13.6	2.4 0
43	56.5 63.6	37.6 31.8	3.5 4.5	2.4 0	0 0
44	15.3 22.7	72.9 54.5	10.6 13.6	1.2 4.5	0 0
45	9.4 22.7	42.4 22.7	17.6 27.3	25.9 22.7	4.7 4.5
46	25.9 27.3	64.7 72.7	4.7 0	3.5 0	1.2 0
47	37.6 31.8	57.6 68.2	3.5 0	1.2 0	0 0
48	14.1 13.6	56.5 40.9	15.3 18.2	11.8 27.3	1.2 0
49	22.4 50.0	72.9 40.9	4.7 4.5	0 4.5	0 0

TABLE 2 (cont.)

<u>Item</u>	<u>SA</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>U</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>SD</u>
50	9.4 27.3	70.6 63.6	15.3 9.1	2.4 0	0 0
51	3.5 13.6	20.0 22.7	21.2 22.7	45.9 31.8	9.4 9.1
52	18.8 36.4	36.5 36.4	27.1 22.7	17.6 4.5	0 0
53	16.5 27.3	47.1 45.5	24.7 18.2	11.8 9.1	0 0

An additional data note is that the Pearson Correlation Coefficient, computed on the basis of sum of responses one through twenty-one to sum of responses to twenty-two through fifty-three, is .3653 with a significance level of .001.

IV. DISCUSSION

The data reported in the previous section does not support the hypothesis of interest in this study. This is evident from the relatively low correlation which exists between the sample scores on the first and second indices of the SHRP. Since the variance in the sum of scores on questions 22-53 is only 13.3% accounted for by the sum of scores on questions 1-21, the presence of other variables seems to be indicated.

Although the null hypothesis cannot be rejected on the basis of this study, the hypothesis of interest is neither indicated to be true or false. Other factors which might have influenced the measurement of such a relationship include religious intensity, the validity and reliability of the SHRP, and the nature of the material surveyed.

As mentioned in the introduction, Gladding, Lewis, and Adkins surveyed religiosity and used their scale in determining groupings for further study. This study, however, did not measure the level of commitment to beliefs which supposedly encourage healthy personality. It is possible to see that although a person might believe the right things, their level of commitment to these tenets might determine the effectiveness with which these tenets

add to life.

The validity of the SHRP can be psychometrically challenged on several grounds. First, the external validity of the SHRP is suspect given its small sample size and the homogeneity of the participants. Secondly, the construct validity of this instrument is questionable due to a lack of similar and dissimilar outside measures for cross-validation purposes. In essence, the pervasive problem with the validity of personality indices is especially appropo in this investigation.

Another factor which might contribute to the questioning of the data is that the reliability of the SHRP was neither shown or tested. This study has no way of ascertaining whether or not the emotional and physical states of the subjects effected the results of the survey in any significant way.

Even with the above factors considered, a more prominent factor might be that the nature of religious belief is impossible to accurately and precisely quantify. The best that one can hope for seems to be that the survey results will come close to representing the true beliefs and attitudes of the subjects.

Nevertheless, since the primary emphasis of this study is on healthy religion, the question can be asked, "What does this study reveal about the state of healthy religion as it exists today?"

The results of the survey indicate that the following areas need to be addressed by religious personnel because these are the areas in which there seems to be the greatest misunderstandings. These areas are listed in order from most misunderstood to least misunderstood.

1. Relation of religion and morality
2. The heuristic nature of belief
3. Doubts about beliefs and the resulting guilt
4. Purpose in life
5. Religion as more than do's and don'ts
6. Sense of brotherhood
7. Fun and enjoyment in religion
8. Self-esteem
9. Self-discovery
10. Religious integration
11. Dealing with bodily desires

Although every religion includes moral codes, moral precepts and exceptions to rigid laws abound. While acting as a guide to morality and encouraging consistent morality, religion does not excuse the believer from thoughtful consideration of right and wrong. But the survey results indicate that only 35.5% of the sample holds to such a complex view of the religion/morality interaction.

The concept of growing and changing lies at the very core of religious experience. Religious beliefs can be held heuristically in the hopes that something even

better and more mature might develop. Yet only 48.2% of the sample indicated that they are so equipped to grow and change in their religious beliefs.

Tied to this last concept, 43.5% of the sample indicated that they experience guilt when they experience doubts. Yet doubt seems to be one of the most readily available roads to more mature and healthy religious sentiment. Religious leaders might reconsider their roles in that they may become guides through the transitions of doubts rather than flagmen sending their followers along detours.

One of the great battle cries of religion has been that it alone can provide ultimate meaning in life. So it is interesting to note that only 57.7% of the subjects indicating that they were religious replied that their beliefs gave them purpose in life. Even though those who are religious search for greater meaning in their lives (70.6% to 45.4%), their search does not necessarily include the spiritual realm.

Religion is still perceived as a system of do's and don'ts by many religious people. Only 60% of the religious respondents indicated that their beliefs were more than compulsions. Those who choose religious systems of do's and don'ts might be considered as deserving of Freud's criticism. Rather than encouraging childishness, healthy religion encourages responsibility and freedom.

Although a balance between individualism and world consciousness is the desirable state of one's religion, only 65.9% of the sample indicated that this balance existed in their religious experience. Religious leaders need to consider this when planning for either an emphasis on personal devotion or corporate worship and world concern. This study indicates that emphasis on corporate worship and world concern might be more appropriate at this point in history.

This author's experience with religion has been that it has added much enjoyment and fun to daily living. Yet only 67.1% of the survey sample report similiar experience. The indication for spiritual leaders is that they need to help their followers to experience freedom and enjoyment as a part of their religion expression.

Self-esteem has traditionally been one of the great martyrs of religion. In Christianity, as noted by Robert Schuller, self-esteem seems to be the only facet of the church was left unreformed. Many people are not only left to wallow in self-degradation, they may even be encouraged to do so. This seems to be the experience of 31.7% of the religious respondents. Almost a third of the the sample seems to be ready to hear that they are worthwhile.

Self-discovery might be considered an offshoot of self-esteem. Prayer, meditation, or any other form of contemplative practice has the effect of self-revelation

whether or not that is the primary goal of the practice. Since 30.6% of the sample has not come to understand themselves any better through their religious experience, the indication seems to be that teaching and/or experience with the above mentioned practices seems to be missing from the religious lives of many people.

Although the vast majority of people who took the SHRP identified themselves as religious, 27.1% of these also indicated that their religious beliefs did not effect them on a daily basis. Thoughts and actions were not necessarily tied to belief. A problem of integration seems to be demonstrated by this fact.

Finally, religious leaders need to seek out ways of helping their followers to deal with bodily desires. This study showed nearly three-fourths of religious people having little or no difficulty in dealing with bodily desires. However, this still leaves lightly over one-fourth who do need to deal with this issue.

In conclusion, healthy religion consists of balance and freedom. Unhealthy religion consists of lop-sidedness and compulsion. Much is going on in the name of religion which seeks to make slaves of those who come to embrace particular belief systems. Religious leaders must examine themselves to determine whether or not they are free. And once they become free, religious leaders have the responsibility of leading others into the maturity

of healthy religion.

Other worthy topics for studies related to this one include:

1. A study which seeks to combine a test of religious intensity and the attitudes which are held intensely.
2. The effects of religious intensity on healthy personality
3. Individual religious attitudes (such as each item of the SHRP, section 1) and their relationship to healthy personality.

As stated in the introduction. all parts of one's life should contribute to the fullness of living. Religious beliefs which accomplish this task should at least be considered as a part of healthy living.

END NOTES

CHAPTER 1

¹Erich Fromm, Psychoanalysis and Religion (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950) p. 26.

²Leornard Gross, God and Freud (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1959) p. 18.

³Morton T. Kelsey, Christo-Psychology (New York: Crossroad Publishing Co., 1982) Introduction.

⁴Samuel T. Gladding, Edward L. Lewis, Lee Adkins, "Religious Beliefs and Positive Mental Health: The GLA Scale and Counseling," Counseling and Values, vol. 25, no. 3 (April 1981) p. 212.

CHAPTER 2

¹Sigmund Freud, The Future of an Illusion (New York: Liveright Publishing Company, 1953) p. 37-39.

²Fromm, p. 18.

³Fromm, p. 12-13.

⁴Fromm, p. 12-13.

⁵Fromm, p. 12-13.

⁶Fromm, p. 11.

⁷Fromm, p. 11.

⁸Fromm, p. 12-13.

⁹Carl Jung, Psychology and Religion (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938) p. 113.

¹⁰Jung, p. 4.

¹¹Jung, p. 114.

¹²Wallace Clift, Jung and Christianity (New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1982) p. 4.

¹³Fromm, p. 64.

¹⁴Fromm, p. 37.

- 15 Fromm.
- 16 Gordon Allport, The Individual and His Religion (New York: Macmillan Company, 1950) p. 11.
- 17 Allport, p. 61.
- 18 Allport, p. 65.
- 19 Paul Tournier, The Whole Person in A Broken World (New York: Harper and Row, 1964) p. 148.
- 20 Tournier, p. 147.
- 21 J. Howard Ellens, "God's Grace and Human Health: The Biblical Theological Base," Journal of Psychology and Christianity, vol. 1, no. 3 (1982) p. 57.
- 22 Barry K. Estadt, Pastoral Counseling (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1983) p. 1
- 23 Howard Clinebell, Jr., The Mental Health Ministry of the Local Church, (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972) chapter 2.
- 24 Clinebell, p. 24.
- 25 Robert H. Schuller, Self-Esteem: The New Reformation (Waco: Word Books, 1982) p. 49.
- 26 George C. Anderson, Your Religion: Neurotic or Healthy (Garden City: Doubleday and Company, 1980) p. 26.
- 27 Sidney M. Jourard and Ted Landsman, Healthy Personality (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1980) p. 6-7.
- 28 Jourard, p. 17-33.
- 29 Jourard, p. 14.
- 30 David Augsburger, Be All You Can Be (Carol Stream: Creation House, 1970)
- 31 Augsburger, p. 12.
- 32 Clinebell, p. 18.
- 33 John 10:10.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allport, Gordon W. THE INDIVIDUAL AND HIS RELIGION. New York: Macmillan Company. 1950.
- Anderson, George C. YOUR RELIGION: NEUROTIC OR HEALTHY. Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc. 1970.
- Augsburger, David. BE ALL YOU CAN BE. Carol Stream: Creation House. 1970.
- Caplan, Ruth. HELPING THE HELPERS TO HELP. New York: The Seabury Press. 1972.
- Clift, Wallace. JUNG AND CHRISTIANITY. New York: Crossroad Publishing Company. 1982.
- Clinebell, Howard Jr. THE MENTAL HEALTH MINISTRY OF THE LOCAL CHURCH. Nashville: Abingdon Press. 1972.
- Conklin, Edmund S. THE PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGIOUS ADJUSTMENT. New York: Macmillan Company. 1929.
- Ellens, J. Howard. "God's Grace and Human Health: The Biblical Theological Base." JOURNAL OF PSYCHOLOGY AND CHRISTIANITY. Vol. 1 (3) P.53-61. 1982.
- Estadt, Barry K. PASTORAL COUNSELING. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1983.
- Freud, Sigmund. THE FUTURE OF AN ILLUSION. New York: Liveright Publishing Co. 1953.
- Fromm, Erich. PSYCHOANALYSIS AND RELIGION. New Haven: Yale University Press. 1950.
- Gelbound, Blair. "Self-Actualization and Unselfish Love." RELIGIOUS HUMANISM. Vol. 13 (2) P. 74-78. 1982.
- Gross, Leonard. GOD AND FREUD. New York: David McKay Company, Inc. 1959.
- James, William. WILL TO BELIEVE. New York: Longmans Green and Company. 1896.
- James, William. THE VARIETIES OF RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCES. New York: The Modern Library. 1902.

Jourard, Sidney M. and Landsman, Ted. HEALTHY PERSONALITY.
New York: Macmillan Publishing Company. 1980.

Jung, Carl Gustav. PSYCHOLOGY AND RELIGION. New Haven:
Yale University Press. 1938.

Kelsey, Morton T. CHRISTO-PSYCHOLOGY. New York: Crossroad
Publishing Company. 1982.

Ortberg, John C. Jr. "Accepting our Acceptance: Some
Limitations of a Rogerian Approach to the Nature of
Grace." JOURNAL OF PSYCHOLOGY AND CHRISTIANITY.
Vol. 1 (1) P. 45-50. 1982.

Schuller, Robert H. SELF-ESTEEM: THE NEW REFORMATION. Waco:
Word Books. 1982.

Tournier, Paul. THE WHOLE PERSON IN A BROKEN WORLD. New York:
Harper and Row. 1964.

Tournier, Paul. THE MEANING OF PERSONS. New York: Harper and
Row. 1957.

Uomoto, Jay M. "Preventive Intervention: A Convergence of
the Church and Community Psychology." JOURNAL OF
PSYCHOLOGY AND CHRISTIANITY. Vol. 1 (3) P.12-22.
1982.

Webber, Robert E. COMMON ROOTS. Grand Rapids: Zondervan
Corporation. 1982.

———. THE HOLY BIBLE: New International Version. Grand
Rapids: Zondervan Bible Publishers. 1978.

APPENDIX

The questions used in the SHRP were all derived from the work of others. It is my intent, within the context of this appendix, to give credit to the others who indirectly wrote this survey.

<u>QUESTION #</u>	<u>CONTRIBUTING PSYCHOLOGISTS</u>
1	Clinebell, Anderson, Tournier
2	Allport, Tournier, Jung
3	Jung
4	Anderson, Ellens, Clinebell
5	Anderson, Schuller, Clinebell
6	Freud, Fromm, Clinebell, Anderson
7	Allport, Fromm
8	Anderson, Jung, Fromm, Clinebell
9	Anderson, Clinebell, Tournier, Ellens, Schuller
10	Freud, Fromm, Tournier, Anderson
11	Anderson
12	Anderson, Clinebell, Freud, Allport
13	Anderson, Freud Tournier, Clinebell
14	Allport, Clinebell, Anderson
15	Jung, Tournier, Anderson
16	Anderson, Clinebell, Allport
17	Jung, Anderson

<u>QUESTION #</u>	<u>CONTRIBUTING PSYCHOLOGISTS</u>
18	Anderson, Clinebell, Fromm
19	Freud, Allport, Tournier, Clinebell, Anderson
20	Clinebell, Freud
21	Clinebell, Anderson, Schuller
22 & 23	Perls
24 - 26	Berne
27	Frankl
28	Ellis
29	Ruesch
30	Blatz
31	Skinner
32	Assagioli, Jung
33 & 34	Freud
35	Adler
36	Rank
37 & 38	Maslow
39 - 46	Augsburger
47 - 53	Maslow

One additional note is that the following questions were stated in such a way as to illicit disagree reponses from people with healthy religion or personality: 7, 11, 12, 14, 18, 20, 22, 23, 25, 26, 30, 31, 36, 37, 39, 46, 48, and 51.

The following survey is a test of religious beliefs and personality. Please report your views as they are now, not as you would like them to be.

Please turn your response form to the side which has EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY printed across the top. Do not mark anything on the response form other than your responses to the items below. The item number corresponds to the test answer number. Please do not make any marks on this questionnaire.

There are five possible responses to each item. Color in A if you strongly agree with the statement. Color in B if you agree. Color in C if you are unsure. Color in D if you disagree. Color in E if you strongly disagree.

Start with question #1 if you consider yourself significantly religious and continue through the end of the questionnaire. If you do not consider yourself significantly religious, please skip to question #22 and continue to the end of the questionnaire. Thank you.

A=Strongly Agree B=Agree C=Unsure D=Disagree E=Strongly Disagree

1. My religion relates me to a group.
2. My religious beliefs significantly effect my daily thoughts.
3. My religious beliefs significantly effect my daily actions.
4. My religion provides me with a basic sense of security.
5. My religion encourages me to think highly of myself.
6. My religion gives me a sense of unity with others, even with those who disagree with my beliefs.
7. My religious views have changed very little since I first started believing them.
8. Practicing my religion results in added fun and enjoyment in life.
9. God still accepts me when I fail or sin.
10. My religion helps me to live with both pleasure and pain.
11. My faith is significantly weakened when things go wrong for me.
12. My religion teaches me to resist all of my basic bodily desires.
13. Practicing my religion increases my knowledge of myself.
14. My religion removes most of the gray areas in morality.
15. My religion gives me purpose in life.
16. My religion encourages me to grow from experience as at least one avenue of learning.
17. My religion encourages me to have a personal relationship with God.
18. My religion basically consists of do's and don'ts.
19. My religion encourages me to accept responsibility for my choices and actions.
20. I feel guilty when I express honest doubts about my religion.
21. Love, rather than fear, describes my main emotion toward God.

Everyone should respond to the following items.

A=Strongly Agree B=Agree C=Unsure D=Disagree E=Strongly Disagree

22. I have memories which prevent me from fully enjoying each new day.
23. Fears of my future often prevent me from fully enjoying today.
24. I feel good about myself even when others criticize me.
25. It is difficult for me to ask for reasonable favors from others.
26. I would rather lie than allow another person's self-concept to be injured by the truth.
27. I look for meaning in whatever happens to me.
28. I often examine my attitudes to determine if they are clear and rational.
29. I communicate extremely well with others.
30. It is difficult for me to develop new skills for coping with life.
31. Knowing the consequences rarely effects what I do.
32. My desires, thoughts, and feelings are usually consistent with my actions.
33. I do productive work.
34. I understand how my past experiences effect my today.
35. I am one with the universe.
36. I would like to be like everyone else.
37. I am often ashamed of how I respond to others.
38. Life is very enjoyable to me.
39. I experience more anxiety than normal when I encounter new situations or people.
40. My anger and other emotions help me to improve myself.
41. I learn much from my failures.
42. I accept myself for who I am but I wouldn't want to stay the same.
43. I believe every human being has value.
44. I try to understand those who treat me wrongly.
45. I can easily forgive and forget.
46. I actively pursue joy and happiness.
47. I have a number of concerns other than myself and my own enjoyment.
48. I prefer to be with others whenever possible.
49. I work well by myself.
50. I appreciate discoveries even long after the newness wears off.
51. I often laugh at other people or groups
52. I am very creative.
53. I resist cultural influences when I disagree with them.
54. Please mark A if you are a male. Please mark B if you are a female.
55. Please mark A if you are 21 yrs. old or under. Please mark B if you are between 22 and 35. Please mark C if you are between 36 and 55. Please mark D if you are over 55. Thank you.